

DD 67

. P35





CULTURE AND WAR

BY

SIMON NELSON PATTEN

Author of *The New Basis of Civilization, Product and
Climax, Advent Songs, etc.*



NEW YORK
B. W. HUEBSCH
1916

Copyright, 1916, by
B. W. HUEBSCH

II 67

P 35

4060
AUG 10 1916

Printed in U. S. A.

© Cl. A 438015

no. 1.

CULTURE AND WAR

RECENTLY an American girl obtained entrance to one of the best circles of a German city, and thought it her duty to help others of her race to gain admittance to this group. To her surprise these endeavors were resented. The general feeling was best expressed by a young Englishman, who said that although Germans in England would "make fools of themselves" to gain a knowledge of English, he would never make a fool of himself to understand German. Controlled by this sentiment, he would not put himself in a position where he seemed inferior to a foreign race, and preferred to go home without attaining the real object of his quest. This may be a lofty patriotism, but think of the cost in misunderstanding, opposition and war. A half of the best blood of the English may be sacrificed because they believe they

“make fools of themselves” if they attempt to understand what the German wants. My experience with American students returning recently from Germany shows them equally irrational. They have seen the outside of Germany, and have merely a dictionary knowledge of German thought. They can talk only of the rudeness of officers, of the pettiness of bureaucrats, and of the debauchery of restaurant life. Is it any wonder that our papers are full of such stories, and that we are rapidly drifting into a state of opinion that makes war almost a certainty.

The element that has made the present world conflict inevitable is not the clash of arms, then, so much as the clash of ideals. At this moment America is deciding whether to follow the way of Europe, and become involved in similar struggle because we are victims of the same prejudices, or to go the way of peace and receive the benefits of increased prosperity. Between these alternatives lies our only choice. The road on which we are already starting has war as its goal—war even more grue-

some and extensive than that of to-day. While the way is yet open, is it not advisable to test the other alternative and see if centuries of degradation and misery cannot be avoided? We must either bluff, bluster, prepare, and then fight; or else we must seek to understand our possible opponents and come into accord with them through mutual concession. This latter route, which seems so easy and simple, is a hard, perhaps an impossible road, for the Briton and American to travel. At bottom, we feel a contempt for other races and approach them in an attitude of superiority that evokes opposition. Even conscientious attempts to interpret the thought of Germany frequently take the form of an apology couched in patronizing language that is most irritating to the people it is supposed to defend. Such articles do not help us to understand the modern German, or to appreciate his philosophy. Nor does the German manifesto signed by some ninety professors do other than confuse the issue. The real consideration is not how these professors write for foreign consumption, but

how they talk to their neighbors and scholars. This is what we must find out if we would understand the German mind, and avoid a useless wrangle of words that masks an irreconcilable conflict.

Let me say a word as to my fitness to interpret the thought of Germany. Forty years ago I began my university work there as a student, and by accident found myself in one of the most ardent of the new groups of moderns. At that time the ideas now universally held were only to be found in the university lecture and seminar. I saw Philosophy, Literature, Classicism, and other figures of the dead past driven out of the big lecture-rooms and put back of the staircase, while the apostles of the new Germanism got the front halls and the government plums. I was even more ardent than my fellows for the new culture, and before I left became the "Stammitglied" in a noted seminar. This phase of the modern spirit was a religion to me then, and for a long time after my return. Now, however, I feel that its force is spent, and that there is a beyond. But my early interest is in-

dicative of my fitness to state in English what Germans really think and to present the cause towards which their devotion goes out.

The prime difficulty that faces an interpreter is in the words selected to convey strange thoughts. If he uses the dictionary equivalent of German words some ridiculous doctrine is sure to appear. If he uses the English equivalents, the dictionary student of German asks who said such a thing, and wins a sweeping victory because there is no one from whom I can quote. German modernism has never been really transformed into a philosophy. It is merely a mode of thought in the making. But we demand a philosophy, and I am compelled to state what I think to be the interpretation, and must use formulæ that I confess I have never seen in German. It is well, in any case, to contrast our thought by stating German ideas in terms that parallel English, and in so doing it is necessary to pick from the English language the words and phrases that best represent the essence of German thinking.

The easy entrance to German thought is not through Kant and Hegel, but by way of certain expressions that everyone uses in Germany. The most elementary of these is the contrast of *Lebendig* (living) and *Starr* (dead). "Lebendig" is a sweet morsel on every German's lips, and represents all that he cherishes. But when he says *Starr* that is the end of the matter; the dead must bury the dead. A fairly good translation of this contrast would be dynamic and static. But the *Lebendig* is more than dynamic. It means also growth, concentration and power. The living grows, and this growth incorporates in itself other elements. It thus gains in power and becomes as it grows a super reality that incorporates all else in it. The minor elements are reabsorbed in the dominant unit, and live again. The living shows its life by flowering, while the dead disappears by disintegration. While any growing thing increases its dominance it is to be admired—yes, even worshiped—but if it ceases to grow or weakens, away with it; it is *Starr*.

But the doing away with it does not in-

volve any lack of historical appreciation. As an element in German history a person or a movement may be admired, which from a cultural view may be dead. An indiscriminate admiration of all the past creates a cheap optimism, and yet a critical attitude also exists that separates the living elements of culture from the honored wrecks of the decaying past. My teachers advised me to study philosophy in such glowing terms that for a time I thought they really believed philosophy to be essential. But later I found they only feared that in my enthusiasm for history, and economics, I might neglect philosophy so much as to court failure in my final examination. Philosophy, in their opinion, was *Starr*. So was religion, Hegel, and other decaying disciplines and heroes. One of my professors was interested in building a new church, and did much to arouse interest in the project. But when analyzed his utilitarian purpose was threefold. He wanted a building of great architectural beauty; he desired a monument to commemorate the valor of the soldiers who fell in the late

war; and finally he thought a church would keep servant girls from stealing spoons. The Church was dead to him for every higher end than teaching humility and self-denial to the serving class.

The dead from this view is not to be judged as good or bad, nor as something on which ruthless hands are to be laid. There was no spirit of iconoclasm nor any emotional antagonism to the disappearing elements of national life. Dead meant merely the outliving of usefulness, and so opposition to further evolution. That which does not accelerate thought and life becomes a menace to further growth. To illustrate, assume that a locomotive carries a train fifty miles an hour. We hitch on ten older engines in the desire to go faster still. There is now a great commotion; the smoke and the flash of wheel appall; but with all the noise and the grandeur of the sight, the speed is less than before. The new engine has the essential points of its lumbering predecessors combined in new ways, and attains results that far surpass its antiquated rivals. So with

a sailing boat that was unrivaled in its day; when the ocean greyhound appears, the once glorious sails are a hindrance and must be displaced. And so with all past deeds and ventures. They are petty and crude when compared with present deeds and thoughts as expressed by even ordinary men. The super pulse carries all along with a speed that old vehicles cannot attain. We hitch our Platos, our Kants, our Shakespeares, our Goethes, and our Emersons to our trains, with much glare, confusion and noise; but neither the intensity of life nor its moral tone is increased. To-day's motives and to-day's vitality fed on present events raise us higher than the level to which past heroes rose. The content of their thought is but a part of our intellectual atmosphere. It has more force as an element of the social pulse than as an isolated whole, grand though that whole may be. To study literature is often to lose touch with life and to get lost in the maze of imperfection that hangs about any great but dead work. Nothing is worth keeping that does not live in the soul of the

people. Would we had a Kaiser to burn libraries once a century!

In English thought the choice is not with the living but with the dead. Its philosophy is best expressed by Herbert Spencer who says Evolution is the integration of matter and the dissipation of motion. Matter is the symbol of the dead; motion that of living. Our philosophy therefore demands that life should continually run down; force is dissipated while dead matter accumulates in great masses. A favorite picture is the final disappearance of man, the ruin of civilization, and the cooling off of the sun. This with us is not pessimism, or at least we think it is not because we premise another world where the failure of this life gets its proper reward. I do not care to question this philosophy, but merely to contrast it with the German. There the dead is dissolving, disappearing, and disintegrating, while life is concentrating, growing, evolving, and hence dominating. Change, Spencer tells us, is the diffusion of motion, and hence the destruction of life, at least the higher forms of

life. The German would say that change means the concentration and the elevation of the living, and the acceleration of their activity.

Such is the essence of the new German philosophy. There is a more abstract way of entering the same field that may help some readers. Reality is a flow, or better stated, a pulse. We do not see dead matter as Spencer assumes, but the pulse in which we for the moment are incorporated. This pulse has antecedents and consequents which we get at by reasoning. When we judge the pulse by what is to follow we have a philosophy of ends out of which our morality grows. The good is that which harmonizes with some end. But ends can be assumed worthy only as to-morrow is like to-day and yesterday. A philosophy of ends thus assumes a changeless, static world; and hence a dead world, for life, growth and change are synonymous terms. A live world can have no philosophy of ends. Life merely grows, continuously, and its ultimate measure is that it grows. But growth also means concentration and

acceleration; and hence a super reality must all the while be emerging that absorbs every minor reality into itself, causing everything to relive and blossom in its new subordination. The lower self thus attains its maximum advantage, not by setting up ends for individual action and moral rules for their attainment, but by absorption in the super reality, and participation in its growth.

This bit of philosophizing is only preliminary to the final question: Where and what is this super reality, this permanence, this acceleration, this unification of force and vitality? There is but one answer—Germany and "Kultur." We say the German worships the State. He does not—he worships Germany. The State is but a physical expression of the great super reality of which it is the symbol. To bring out this thought and thus connect Germany with super reality is the work of the modern German historian. He starts from the crude historical beginnings of the German race, and shows how it has assimilated and incorporated all the elements of earlier

civilization and given them permanence. Everything thus flows into Germany and becomes a part of "Kultur." The State has thus become the physical representative of the great super reality before whose irresistible power all else must crumble and fade into nothingness. Foreigners miss the point of this stimulating doctrine by counting noses to see which nation has the larger number of great men. But it is not credit for the origin of new ideas on which the German advocate rests his case. Germany is the great assimilator of ideas, which remain isolated entities until they find their place in German culture. All is grist to the German mill and serves for the exaltation of Germany to a higher plane.

Thus far I have tried to impress but a single point in German thought involving a marked contrast to English philosophy. Instead of energy gradually dissipating itself, leaving a huge concentrated mass of dead matter, it is energy that grows, concentrates and surmounts, leaving the dead institutions, traditions or philosophies to be dispersed and subordinated. There is

then a higher unity becoming apparent, which shows itself as cooperative action. This pulse, which sweeps all along in spite of themselves, finds expression in the State, whose superiority is even now recognized; and when still higher forms of concentration appear this institution will be the one current into which all life flows.

This is the new political philosophy whose creeds and dogmas run counter to our accepted notions. I have no desire to defend this view of life, but rather to explain what is gained by its acceptance, and point out how its seeming evils and defects are guarded against. It should be recognized that this super pulse has no consciousness, and hence no feeling and no morality. State decisions are good or evil, but never right or wrong. The agent of the State may do wrong, and hence be subject to punishment. But of the act of the State there is but one valid judgment: Did it produce adjustment and hence increase the vitality and concentration needed for growth? Then it is good. Were the opposite true the evil must be

righted by a reversal of the earlier defective decision. Policies become law through their success. No other judgment is valid.

But this viewpoint will shock the adherents of ancestral creeds even less, perhaps, than that which I am about to make. All ideals and end philosophies must be discarded as representing static concepts that mar the evolution of the super soul. If an individual accepts an ideal and works for its realization, it is good only so long as he and the national super reality of which he is a manifestation do not change. Any evolution of himself or of the communal spirit makes the old ideal or end bad, and thus forces him either to abandon it or recognize it as an obstacle that must be displaced as society advances. The idealist and the end philosopher are always behind the age worshiping the has-been or might-be instead of the becoming. The movement of the national pulse should be the guide for individual action, and not personal judgments, aims, or emotions. We move; we go; we grow; that we move, go

and grow is the test of superiority, and not the end towards which we are moving.

This reversal of accustomed views seems to leave us without a guide, with no stability or animating force. But the change brings consolations as well as dangers. The new viewpoint is difficult to gain, yet it may be claimed that by this other route all of the old results are attained and a rich surplus acquired in addition. Let me illustrate: Suppose the aim is to raise the religious life of the community. A missionary might do this by setting up definite ends and ideals towards which each individual should strive. But if the world is dynamic each year would increase the lack of adjustment between the desired end and the evolving national pulse; each year would see more dissipation of energy due to this maladjustment until death and dissolution result. The ideal may seem glorious to live for, but in the end we and it must die. Again we have the old story of the dissipation of energy and the concentration of matter, for what is an ideal or end out of harmony with vital processes but a dead

incumbrance that lowers and devitalizes? Contrast this attitude with that of a man who would rid the world of some disease. If smallpox or fever is eliminated we merely have more life. The healthy person lives more abundantly; yet nothing is done to fix the end toward which he moves or the ideals that inspire him. Everyone moves on more rapidly, more smoothly, and more in harmony with the output of others' energy. The individual is happy and the State thrives. What more can be asked?

There is a single thought behind these examples. The present is a pulse of which there are antecedents and consequents. Which of these is the better object of study, and which gives the firmer basis of judgment as to social good? If we modify the antecedent the effect is directly measurable in the vitality and growth of the super pulse of which we are a part. The emphasis of antecedents, then, shows a growth of social as opposed to personal ends, while a consideration of ends subordinates the social and vital to the personal. In a crude primitive society the dominance of

the personal over the vital may be justified, but in each epoch of advance the antecedent of action becomes clearer and more measurable, while the attainment of personal ends becomes a useless dissipation of energy. Surely, then, in our advanced state we are justified in a radical break with old concepts, that we may have life and have it more abundantly.

Here are two philosophies. The one judges conduct by its antecedents and causes; the other by the ideals or ends to be attained. To study ends is an old vocation, and out of it has come our fixed, dogmatic attitudes, and cramping concepts of art and life. In the old thought we shoot at marks even if we know they are out of range. But all science relates to antecedents and causes. The events of yesterday and the pulse of to-day are under our observation; from our knowledge of them comes our advance to new levels of intelligence and activity. And what are these guiding principles of action based solely on past and present events and with no slippery elements of an unsurveyed future?

A German would reply in three words—*Dienst*, *Ordnung*, and *Kraft*. The best translation of these terms which I can suggest would be service, conformity and growth. We miss the vital point in the German view when we start with *Kraft* and call it force. *Kraft* is really the final stage of evolution; it is a mark of superiority only as the preceding stages have been faced and surmounted. The first and primary word in the new German philosophy is *Dienst*, not *Kraft*. Here the German claims a superiority over the English view of life. The first question of an Englishman is, "What am I to get out of it?" This judgment is not to be interpreted in a bad sense, but merely shows that he has a measured attitude, summing up the personal advantages and disadvantages of his acts before decision is made. The German, however, holds that the sacrifice of self-interest to the higher social life is the first duty of a man, and that no personal motive should weigh in the scale against it. Indeed, to talk of a super man is not German; the author of this phrase did not

catch the true spirit of his countrymen. Service, and not domination is their first principle; and this is made a vital part of each child's education. The German boy learns to serve before he learns to think. His freedom comes only with maturity, not with learning how to walk. Long years of implicit obedience, quick response to command, the subordination of self, respect for authority—all this discipline and more is imposed on a child; through it his character is made. We are likely to overlook this emphasis of service and think obedience is forced on subjects by State authority; but the present war, if nothing else, should show the falsity of this superficial view. Service is eager, genuine, and heartfelt. The spirit of calculation and self-aggrandizement is absent when the higher interests of Germany are endangered, or when the cultural life of the people is threatened. The goal of the German may be wrong, but his motive is genuine and unselfish.

The second basis of German culture lies in what they call *Ordnung*. This means

stability of institutions if we think of results, but there is more than mere stability involved. It includes all the arrangements and methods by which the civil life expresses itself in an orderly way. It will not do to translate *Ordnung* by our phrase "law and order," because with us this merely means the submission to recognized authority. The law may be wrong and the submission may be servile, as when a court interferes to break up a strike. Such invasion of public rights we call "law and order" and tamely submit to the evils it imposes. But *Ordnung* with the Germans involves a much higher thought. It means the kind of a rule that increases adjustment, the regulation that promotes prosperity. It implies not merely a submission to State regulation, but covers every area of life, and thus gives to the service of the individual the higher meaning that the new culture demands. *Ordnung* is thus not "law and order," but an arrangement of life and activity by which our inner emotions correspond to our outer conditions, giving rise to a harmonious current

of progress and growth. If these two concepts—*Dienst* and *Ordnung*—are mastered, the meaning of *Kraft* becomes intelligible. *Kraft* is the measure of *Dienst* and *Ordnung*. Public service and complete adjustment are to be judged, not by some superimposed end or ideal that cramps as approach is made, but by the acceleration and effectiveness of the national pulse in putting aside the remaining obstacles to progress. The national pulse must grow, surpass, and conquer; or it must stagnate and finally dissolve into its elements. Success and decay are the only measures of national efficiency. The pulse that dominates and absorbs other pulses becomes the super-pulse; its *Ordnung* alone is worthy of admiration, and its service alone becomes a permanent source of satisfaction.

The duty of the individual is the duty of accelerating and augmenting the national pulse, and not of fixing its goal. This is the only rule of personal conduct, the only morality if action is to be judged by its antecedents, and not by its results. Shall we move towards God and be content that

God approves, or must we confine our efforts to some goal that we can see, appreciate, and finally reach? Is the pleasure of doing and growing greater than that of reaching ends? Did God work six days on some definite plan that could be perfectly realized, or was there more to do on the seventh day than on the first because His concept had grown so rapidly that the universe was less complete than before? These are the problems that separate from each other two concepts of life. As the view clears we leave the confusion of the past and rise to the new level. Good and evil become clearly recognized only as the scales fall from the eyes and we enter a world with a new dimension. Such is the difference between the old and the new civilization, and the extent of the change involved in passing from the one to the other.

We can avoid the use of *Kraft* with its double meaning by stating the three German ultimates as service, conformity and achievement. Service is effective only by conforming to natural law, and its success

measured in present product is achievement. We often hear our culture contrasted with theirs in the number of great men each civilization has produced. In this list are put only the great discoverers of truth. This method of judging might be accepted by a few of the older generation of Germans who are still proud of Kant, Hegel, and Goethe; but I feel sure the newer and at present dominant thought would refuse to accept the test. German thought has changed its emphasis from discovery to achievement. He who turns the force of nature into useful channels gets the praise and holds positions denied the mere scholar. Service and conformity thus produce immediate results; the life of the State is broadened and the level of culture heightened by each new application of science to everyday affairs. The national pulse gains impetus by each conquest, and the absorption of the one in the all becomes more apparent. Happy is he who so lives that the whole nation profits by his deeds.

As contrasted with this subordination of the person in the State through service,

conformity and achievement the English ideal is that of self-interest and personal salvation. We contrast not objective good and evil, but subjective right and wrong. Right is thus a personal emotion, not an objective conformity to natural law. From interest and right we go to freedom, and measure our advance not by achievement, but by our power to isolate ourselves from the social pulse, and to resist the onflow that submerges the individual under the current of conformity. Our heaven is a hiding-place for saved individuals, not the unification of the dominant currents of the universe. We are moral in the sense of conformity to custom and tradition; Germans are moral in the sense of conformity to natural law. They live in the present; we live in the past. This ancient goal, fixed and institutionalized has nothing in it that did not lie in an initial golden age. We drop back and recover but do not go ahead. The long, weary tramp of the ages only leads to what our forefathers had. All this, pretty as a picture, is static, dead, hopeless, when compared with a vital evo-

lution that leads to the great unknown and burns its past to get more fuel for present progress. To-morrow is not yesterday relived, but a ceaseless flow drawing all life together, yielding joy through the increase of its speed. If the planets move but never arrive, why should not life also have its measure in growth and acceleration?

Thus far we have had to do with the better side of German development and with the elements in German culture that stand in contrast to our ideas. As a philosophy it is a vital, economic interpretation of society to be contrasted with materialism, mechanism, and finalism. Force is pictured in it as growth, economy, and organization instead of a concept of repellent units that dissipate while matter aggregates. I am charmed by this philosophy, especially when it is expounded by an eloquent professor. Then, in turn, I am bitterly disappointed to see what a small product comes from the mill. The initial chapters of such a book stir the soul, but when you read on the discussion drifts from some world vision to the settlement

of some insignificant German problem. A really world view the new German has not yet attained. He either slips back to the old philosophical attitude; or one is disappointed to find that his only interest seems to be in current questions. All this is intelligible when one reflects that German thought is not a unified whole, but merely a cyclonic upheaval, the force of which is not yet spent. The best parallel is the early stages of the French Revolution, when new ideas were blended with old traditions in a most fantastic manner. Such is the course of all revolutions. A philosophy half understood and poorly applied; a goal partly seen and wrongly interpreted; an enthusiasm eagerly spent on great and small objects alike; an intense nationalism so blind that it thinks itself to be a world vision—these are blended in all radical movements, and are the source at once of their power, their extravagance, and their failure to create immediate transformations.

Were these changes in thought merely German we might seek to crush them out as

the aristocrat sought to crush the French Revolution; but the forces that make for the new German culture are world-wide, and their ultimate success can be as little hindered as could the French Revolution. We save our energy, vitality, and our civilization not by opposing change, but by understanding its antecedents and by reducing the shock of the transition to a new status. The world must accept German culture, just as it was forced to become democratic. But it must do more than that, for this culture is not a goal, but merely a stage. Much that Germany rejects in its radical upheaval must be incorporated in the super-culture. German thought is thus the initial stage of a new evolution of thought and life. We are static; they are dynamic. Where they have gone on and hence differ from us, they are in the right. Where they are wrong is where they still hold identical views with those prevailing in the Anglo-American world. We do not see this because we consciously misinterpret their philosophy so as to give a basis for our ha-

tred of coming change as personified in national differences.

These facts can be brought out only by analyzing the German defense of culture and nationalism. The essential element of a culture philosophy is the growing super-pulse which in its victory absorbs and conserves everything else. In contrast to this, nationalism involves a struggle, a defeat, and annihilation of the weaker unit. It is the philosophy of hate, of opposition, and of material triumph. We have the same thought in the doctrine of biologic struggle, which our leading thinkers accept with the eagerness of a German patriot. We kill Indians as ruthlessly as they kill Belgians, and justify ourselves on the same grounds. The good plant drives out the bad plant; the good man advances by the elimination of his weaker adversary. The German patriot says we advance through war; his English compeer holds that advance is through struggle. The difference in these two attitudes is slight. If progress is a struggle, the good advancing only through the elimination of the weak, war

is a blessing, and so is disease, hardship and grinding poverty. The only question is whether it is more humane to kill people outright by bullets and shrapnel, or to starve them by low wages and bad housing.

I have wandered from my theme to make clear the similarity of German and English views in the field where both nations, being static, permit the cruel grind of circumstance to determine survival. In expressing this static war philosophy two words are used by the German—*Entartung* (degeneration) and *Krieg* (struggle). War, we are told by a unison of voices that makes it seem national, is a purging process by which the weak and defective, losing ground, disappear. The small nations and the peaceful nations, lacking vigor, are static or degenerating. To reincorporate them into a vigorous, growing nation is thus a blessing, even if some hardship ensues. The greater vitality due to this blending and unifying process soon recoups the loss and brings additional gains in the form of a higher culture. A small culture is impossible; a small state is therefore a

degenerating bane, and not the goal of progress, as the English assume. Culture is Germany; it can rise to new levels only as Germany, in which it is embodied, expands and dominates. Thus a gospel that starts with culture as its ideal is soon transformed into an intense nationalism making war an instrument of advance.

This is one side of German philosophy. *Krieg*, or struggle, as we name it, is the sole cause of progress, brought by the elimination of the unfit that war pressure creates. The popular contrast to this is *Entartung*, or, as we would say, degeneration. Struggle means progress, while the lack of struggle (peace) is the source of retrogression and decay. A long peace, says a book at my elbow, is the worst of all evils. But we do not need to go to German literature to find staunch advocates of this view. It is what we called the biological theory of progress if taught in its new form, and the basis of history if the doctrine is stated as our fathers saw it. Every nation, the historian tells us, has its period of youth and decay. The seeds of decay lie in the es-

sence of national life, and sooner or later the rotting process exerts its influence and brings its dire results. The moralist and the religious teacher are sure that all progress is vanity, and that each uplift is followed by decay, wreck, and ruin. Even the economist thinks prosperity softens a race and makes it unfit for competition with neighboring races. "Three generations from shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves" is a popular adage, showing the hold the traditional view has on the public mind.

To these older beliefs the new science has added several more, and so revives a doctrine that might otherwise have fallen into decay. It is assumed that the unfit breed more rapidly than the fit, and tend to dominate. Race suicide is another lamented evil. Many statistics are given to show that the intelligent class are actually dying out. To these may be added the degenerate effects of extravagance, vice, and dissipation. The growth of income, instead of steadying its recipients and arousing more motives for work, is assumed to make men careless, indifferent, and ineffi-

cient. There may be added the long tirades against the modern woman, her independence, and her self-assertion. She refuses to fulfill the duties of motherhood when life is made pleasant and easy by the increase of income.

This is a meager list of the woes that the historian, moralist, and social philosopher find to follow the increase of prosperity, good living and high culture. I do not wish to argue, but merely to point out that if the premises of this philosophy are correct, the German is not so far out of the way when he would displace all this degeneration by frequent war. So long as our thinkers can find no "moral equivalent for war" why should we object to a military system that accentuates national difference, and thus by its frequent wars brings a moral uplift to each race? If half that has been said is true of the moral uplift taking place in England, France, and Russia since the beginning of the present war, Germany should be thanked for bringing on so great an awakening. To say the least, our philosophy in this respect is not

superior or different from that of the German on these points. We, however, are consistent because our whole philosophy is based on the concept of struggle. If hardship, subordination, and self-denial form the only road to moral integrity, while peace, love and culture lead to stagnation and decay, America must degrade her workers to gain purity of soul. The German has partly broken with dead materialism of this sort, and it is only where he has remained static that his concepts resemble ours. Yet struggle and degeneration are complementary thoughts, and there is no escape from their evils without a complete transformation of our ancestral philosophy.

German thought is thus a composite of two antagonistic elements. Its cultural philosophy is new and has a dynamic basis. Were Germany's progress determined by this philosophy it would have a peaceful triumph and be a world blessing. But the philosophy of conflict with its battle-cries of war and degeneration holds a coördinate place, causing many queer blendings of the old and the new. Thus the elements of our

own philosophy that Germany has not yet rejected make most of the present difficulty. Germany as culture, and Germany as a race, seem to the German people to be one concept, and will in their minds remain one concept so long as the physical Germany is repressed by foreign antagonism. The Germans think themselves to be on the defensive in this and previous wars because of their past suffering from invasion, and because present Germany is less than historic Germany. Continued restraints or future defeats will strengthen the racial spirit at the expense of culture, while an expansion of Germany beyond its racial limits is sure to repress race feeling and increase the influence of culture. The larger Germany must come to an understanding with the Slavs, Poles, and other races, and through this understanding the opposition of race interests will gradually disappear. It can be said that two-fifths of the German people are in thought antagonistic to the military policy and its emphasis on war as a purging process. Expanding Germany so that the now dom-

inant three-fifths become only two-fifths in the larger State would cause the cultural elements to dominate, and as a result a lasting peace would be attained. Where States are small and formed on racial lines the opposition of interest and feelings is greatest. Here the philosophy of struggle has its greatest hold and will produce its direst effect in war. Economic and cultural interests are, however, broader than racial groups into which the world is divided. Where they dominate States grow in size and race feeling is eliminated. There is perhaps room for a half dozen independent, self-sufficient States in the world; but not for the many scores of small States which the persistence of national boundaries on racial lines would uphold.

What has thus far been said shows the causes of present controversies and the stakes of the conflict. The essential point is this: The world has entered a new stage in its social evolution. All nations feel the new world-pulse, but some more than others. This localizes the movement,

putting the radicals in control in some countries, the conservatives in others. Issues thus get a national coloring while the conflict becomes intense over problems not pertinent to the real issue. Every great advance of this kind has emerged as a race movement, and in its early stages was a patriotic expression of national feeling. The most notable instances are Hebrew religion, Grecian thought, and French democracy. In each case the national phases of the new movement dominated and colored the viewpoint. Only slowly were the general aspects developed from the local. When through the elimination of the national elements people learn to state the new thought as a general principle, the new acquires a world-wide vogue. Religion is not Hebrew; the intellect is no longer Grecian; democracy is no longer associated with the French Revolution. So the time will come when we can appreciate the new culture without associating it with Germany. If thought can be separated from tradition, the Church from the State, and democracy from mob rule, culture and war

may be separated, bringing as great a revolution as that which followed any of the earlier epochs.

It is one thing, however, to state the problem, and quite another to show how the separation may be effected. We cling to old views and cherish ancestral tradition with a vigor and partisanship that thwarts earnest endeavors to reconstruct national views along sane lines. The difficulty of the transition is much increased by the way in which the problem is faced. We demand a cure-all for war—some simple panacea to which no objection can be made. To this but one reply can be given. There is no such remedy. The change is a change of attitude that affects all social and vital relations, some more, some less fundamentally; but with the result that no evil is completely cured, but that many, if not all of them, have their virulence diminished. What evil has Grecian culture, Hebrew religion, or the French Revolution cured? None, we would have to reply, though many ills have been reduced. So will it be when culture

dominates over struggle instead of compromising with it, as is the case at present. This will mean that new outlets of energy are found; that the interests of individuals will conflict less than before; or, better stated, the pressure that degenerates, debases and antagonizes will lose much of its present power.

A good way to illustrate this thought is to state the contrast, as many recent writers have put it. What they ask is the moral equivalent of wars. They seek a new morality that will have the effectiveness of the old without the brutal struggles war imposes. So they spend their time contriving schemes that will "harden" people as war has done, but produce the same flow of energy and the same disposition on the part of the individual to "sacrifice" his interests for some assumed good. Why, it is asked, should we not have a general conscription of both young men and women, employing them to build roads, dig ditches, scrub floors, wash dishes, and perform other disagreeable tasks that they might gain the humility of person and the moral exalta-

tion that war is assumed to give? The reply is that the way out from war is not moral restraint, but economic liberation. We do not want to dig ditches and scrub floors, but to get rid of disagreeable tasks. The new culture must oppose economic hardships as earnestly as it opposes war, and for the same reason. We get culture as we intensify our wants and reduce the amount of disagreeable toil. We gain as the State ceases to impose burdens; we rise as the Church, ceasing to be a mere consolation, becomes the medium for genial enjoyment and inspiration. Hardship, toil, and exploitation are the opposite to all this, and any morality that makes them appear to be blessings must go with the disappearance of war and its train of evils. We want not a restraining morality, but activity; not sacrifice, but joy; not toil, but harvest. These are the essence of culture, and these are the motives putting society on an economic instead of a moral basis.

One can claim all this unreservedly and yet admit that many evils that now exist will not be removed; yea, some of them

may even be increased. We want a morality and a state, but they must work in a new direction, gain their results by new methods. What we want them to do we cannot clearly state, because we cannot foresee the changes that culture will bring, and how old evils will revitalize themselves under the new conditions. But these facts should not make us hesitate about accepting the new culture and working enthusiastically for its advance. Many of the evils that prophets predicted about democracy have proved true—some persist in exaggerated forms. But this fact has not stood in the way of democratic advance, nor are the losses so great as to counterbalance the good democracy has brought. So with culture; it must be seen to be appreciated and judged. Its evils doubtless will be many, but how to curb them we can only know when the new culture dominates the popular thought. A full stomach brings many diseases, but few would be willing to accept starvation as a cure. First fill the stomach and then learn how to control the appetite. So we learn

to appreciate, to love, to long for nature, to feel the thrill of beauty, and then learn the self-control which the new situation demands. "Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof." If we seek and gain the good of the world, the accompanying evils can in some way be overcome.

The question, "Where can we look for a moral equivalent of war?" can be answered only by dividing the problem into two parts. We need a new man and a new viron. The new man cannot fit the old viron, nor can we determine what the qualities of the new man should be by picturing him against a background of present conditions. We must get the new viron first, and then energize and educate men so that they will respond to their new situation. The important point to remember is that we already know what this new viron should afford and how it may be acquired. The objective side of the new world is already discernible, as are the means of its attainment. The evil of the old viron may be expressed in one word—*poverty*. We get the key to its elimination when we real-

ize that poverty is not due to the lack of inherited talent, but to bad external conditions. The theory that hardship produces character seems like satire when we realize that poverty is the most brutal and widespread hardship, and that its victims are always those who have the least character. A certain minimum of income, much larger than the day-laborer now receives, is a necessary prerequisite to character-building; no nation can give character to its people till the load of poverty is taken from their shoulders. Fortunately the increase of productive power permits the attainment of this minimum. A new social level is now possible upon which a society may be built without the woe that blocked earlier progress. Do not, however, understand me to say that while the lack of income prevents character, the pressure of income will insure character. Income is merely a condition to the appearance of character, not its cause or source. The objective is merely the soil in which the spiritual may grow.

We get much nearer the source of char-

acter when we view it as an index of health rather than of income. Only as income blossoms in health can we measure its benefits. Only as it undermines health by its dissipations can we measure its evils. Income separates society into two parts—the health seekers and the pleasure seekers. The one growing in character survives; the other degenerates and disappears. The increase of income thus gives us a type of elimination that works as rigorously as war, without its crudeness and brutality. Health culture is thus the prime form of culture, and only as its conditions become clear can an effective elimination take place that will check dissipation and vice. Health motives are far the most effective; they have the advantage that they enforce themselves.

Each decade gives a clearer presentation of health needs and a better appreciation of advantages. More knowledge is doubtless coming, but even if no more than exists at present were attainable we have only to wait its general diffusion to attain a standard of vigor, economy, and

temperance that contrasts sharply the low level of the past with the brighter future ahead. Few realize the enormous change in attitude that will result because they fail to see that the lack of character now so manifest is largely the result of the shortness of human life and the prevalence of disease. An average life of less than thirty years has already been lengthened by a half. We may soon hope for a life of sixty years for those who reach the marriageable age. This will mean that children will arrive at maturity before parents lose their productive power. There will then be no slump in family standards, which results from the early disability of parents and the necessary exposure of children to the evils of self-support. Family life will thus be a sustaining force that will elevate each generation above its predecessor. From income we move to health, and from health to a purer family life. Thus will the attractive forces of culture work out a salvation without struggle or hardship of any sort. A self-sustaining upward current is created that carries with it

all who have health, income and enterprise.

To these motives must be added another force well-grounded in human nature, which can be relied on to make effective the trend towards social regeneration. Adam Smith was right in claiming for sympathy as fundamental a place as that given to self-interest. Sympathy now shows its influence in every decision the group makes; and if not morality itself, as Adam Smith claimed, it is at least the basis on which morality rests. As an element in evolution its influence is mainly seen in the problems of rehabilitation that must be faced in any epoch of social advance. Were survival determined by struggle alone, the weak would be wiped out in a brutal fashion. Unfortunately the weak in this brute struggle are the great mass of mankind. The dominant tenth have more power in struggle than the remaining nine-tenths. Misery, poverty, and exploitation are necessary results through which happiness and culture remain the possession of the favored few. Yet in heredity

this depressed mass have the same mental and physical qualities as their masters. The determining factor of struggle is not that of character, but of external advantage, either in material prosperity or in education.

In opposition to these tendencies human sympathy softens the hardships of the unfortunate, and increases the relative number of those gaining enough mastery over nature to participate in the national culture. With the growth of economic welfare more effort is expended on endeavors to rehabilitate the weak, and the measure of their success is larger. Instead of the tenth that brute struggle would put at the top, we have perhaps forty per cent. of the population sufficiently nourished and protected to participate in the social advance of the nation. This change is the measure of human sympathy as an upbuilding force. If such an advance has been made under the bad social conditions of the past, we may hope that the time is not far distant when a substantial majority of the people will feel the force of the new impulse that

culture evokes. When this happens the political structure on which society rests will be radically altered. Steady, rationalized progress will displace the spasmodic efforts of advance we now make. New problems of rehabilitation can then be faced with the assurance that at least nine-tenths of the population may be so freed from the evils of vice and poverty that motives of self-improvement dominate. Should this happen, the remaining tenth, the really defective, can be removed from society to be tenderly cared for, and cease to be a menace to social advance.

Human nature is not bad, but good. Its dominant motives are the result of a long period of favorable evolution, and show their vigor when external conditions permit. The fundamental wrongs lie not in human nature, but in the defective organization of society. It is a new society, not a new heredity, that we need—new social bonds, and not new personal traits. Self-interest, the yearning for life and sympathy, are thus the integrating forces on which the initial uplift of society depends.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that they are all of human nature. There are disintegrating as well as integrating forces. Of these the more prominent are passion, greed, and fear. Hate is not a trait in human nature, but fear may readily become hate where social groups contend fiercely for the mastery. Hate is fear plus struggle; and its disintegrating force is apparent in all tribal organizations that come to us from the primitive world. It is an acquired attitude and would disappear were the social units of the world so organized that struggle ceases. Greed also is not a personal trait, but is the outcome of a defective social organization permitting wealth and want to exist side by side. Greed flowers in an aristocracy and in regions under autocratic control. In a democracy its force is weakened, and its power would be broken if a state of comfort were attained by all. Sex passion is likewise disintegrating in a society where personal indulgence gives the motive for struggle and aggression. Where one sex is the prey and the other the master, passion

rules, and sex slavery produces the evils of over-population.

These disintegrating elements dominate, not on their own right, but through defective social organizations that encourage them and restrain the counter traits of self-interest, self-conservation and sympathy. The picture of human nature that we call to mind should not be of a depraved nature controlled by hate and greed, nor of a spiritual nature that knows only love and beauty. Both elements are present; the one or the other dominates as it is favored or repressed by the prevailing social organization. We should not think of humanity moved by irresistible tendencies like those of physics; its forces should be pictured like those of biology, where dominant and recessive characters contend for the mastery, and the success of each group is determined by vironal conditions. Society is the determiner, and on its decisions depends the control or lack of control of given traits. That under certain conditions a given trait does not appear is no evidence of its non-existence. The recessive

traits of one society become the dominant motives of its successor. To social changes, therefore, we must look for the revival of seemingly lost traits, and not to the selection of individuals in whom some traces of desired characters appear. Eugenics might give us a different man with other dominant and recessive traits; but to social changes we must look for the dominance of desired traits, and for the stability of those institutions that promote culture, coöperation, and general prosperity.

To the degree that fear, greed, and sex create the dominant motives for social action, life, vigor and sympathy are repressed by the tribal, class and race antagonisms which primitive passions evoke. Struggle is ever present, and in its train come the evils that arise in a divided society with its caste traditions. Servant and master, lord and retainer, capitalist and laborer, Jew and Gentile, man and woman, indicate the oppression and contrast that military struggle evokes. The crust of prejudice and tradition remains firm long after societies have become democratic and

industrial. We are in a new régime, but are yet fettered by the feudal bonds that persist as the basis of character, morality and religion. Until these elements are clarified and harmonized with our industrial life, no systematic advance can be made.

To get a pure industrial life does not consist in the wiping out of the traits on which military rule depends, but in evoking traits a military state represses. This evoking force is culture. In the new world culture is not ideal dreaming. It is the motives leading to public service, a joy in others' welfare, an interest in what is to be instead of what has been. Culture is thus zeal, not enjoyment; self-subordination, not self-dominance. The super-man is servant, not ruler; creator, not recipient. The change sought lies not in heredity, nor alone in the environment, but in the acquired traits aroused by education and personal contact. The rigid customs, traditions, and habits of thought brought over from the realm of struggle lose their definite cohesions and flow on harmoniously

with the larger pulse in which they are incorporated. Mobility is the goal of the change; vitality its means and culture its essence. The person, lost in the onward flow, gets his joy in a service that helps the super-pulse to grow. Life is measured by the super-life which self-yielding promotes. This new view, like the natural theology of our fathers, seeks to show that the ultimates of nature are benign. Nature is not "red-toothed" and hostile. Struggle and hardship are not the sponsors of progress, but its deadly foes.

When the origin of degeneration and depravity in bad vironal conditions becomes plain, to discuss them again is only to repeat what has already been said. Suffice it to say that degeneration is dissipation due to sudden changes in material wealth before culture has had time to create safeguards against the wrong use of income. It is not therefore intrinsically bad, but merely the first stage in a forward movement. The spendthrift comes first; culture follows; and then the missionary is needed to restore and elevate. Does each epoch begin

with the attainment of culture, to be followed by a development of religion, and then by the onset of dissipation and depravity? Or does each epoch start with new wealth, its misuse, and then right itself through culture and religion? The one outlook is as doleful as the other is bright. If the latter view is correct personal morality consists in keeping healthy, in self-preservation, in acquiring culture, in adjustment to nature, and in industrial effectiveness. True morality is not a means of salvation, nor has it the keys to some distant realm. Its test is in to-day's events and in to-morrow's adjustment.

Health measured in these terms involves energy, and energy is the forerunner of imagination. If energy and imagination stand in a causal relation, the passage from the virional to the spiritual world is easy and natural. Out of our sense concepts colored and transformed by the imagination we gain motive and zeal; from them will is an outgrowth—not the will to resist and deny, but the will to do and achieve. When will becomes achievement it loses it-

self in service. Thus the current of personal life diverted from the world pulse returns to its source augmented and elevated. Each personal life is a purifying blend gaining impetus in its isolation, and returning to accelerate the massive pulse from which it came. The virion yields its increase as it is transformed into life, and life becomes noble as its energy further augments the world pulse.

Using this method of correcting and completing German thought its fundamental concept may be stated apart from its national elements, and thus a world philosophy created. Life is a pulse, not an equilibrium. Culture is the unification and acceleration of this pulse. It is the means by which the individual life is brought in harmony with the world-pulse that is its source and end. At any given moment this pulse has a level tending to draw all below this level up to its standard. Dissipation, crime, vice, hate and antagonism cannot be cured by acting on individual cases, but by the acceleration of the world pulse that draws everything up to its

level and reincorporates the cross-currents in the onflow towards harmony and life. We cannot save one individual except by losing others; but we can blend groups, classes, nations and races into larger units where interest and sympathy dominate over race antagonism. In the larger units thus created fewer people will be defective or dependent. Social salvation is measured by this relative growth of the normal and the increasing pressure they exert to lift their neighbors to their level. The problems of this uplift are economic, vital and emotional. Trust the world-pulse and all is well. We need faith in budding life, not in a frozen creed—a new social philosophy with purer notions of God, culture and humanity.

But these elements and this faith, important as they are, show less than the whole truth. Personal duty, personal responsibility, and personal integrity are quite as real in a live world as in a dead one. It is their office, not their essence, that changes. The duty and responsibility of the normal consists not in lifting the depraved to nor-

mality, but in raising themselves to a super-normal plane. The world-pulse of to-morrow can be directed only by a deeper insight into world processes than normal people possess. To be influential one must be ahead of others. The old morality was a morality of the low for the benefit of the high. The new morality frees the weak from restraint, thus letting them rise to their natural level. It imposes restraint on the good in proportion as they are better. The more surplus one creates the less is his own. The great bow before the humble, to whom comes the joy their betters earn. The term super-man is a new phrase, but the thought it conveys is the essence of the old thought. Nominally the old morality made all serve, but practically it led to the subordination of the weak to the strong. The great were practically free from the sacrifice and hardship imposed upon their neighbors. They lived for themselves, not for others. Reverse this attitude and the flow of goods that accompanies it creates a new morality. The lower classes are freed from restraint. They live to-day and have

a return for each day's effort in the day's joy. They approximate the level that the world-pulse creates for them. They live longer and better by moving with the world flow.

Recently a prominent bishop said that low wages was never the cause of a woman's fall. She could, if she would, resist temptation. Admitting this fact, what has she or society gained by her meager existence and shortened life? Woman's first duty is the reproduction of the race. Society advances, not as she shows a power to resist the tendency for which she was created, but as it establishes conditions that permit her to become a mother. The material level necessary for health and child-bearing is the nation's responsibility. The producing of a superior child is her share. The moral energy of women should not be wasted to produce results that cultural means can attain. Men, in turn, are responsible not for yielding to temptation, but for not growing to a full manhood. Society should hold us up to its level. We should then rise above it. We build char-

acter not as we say "no," but as breaking with tradition we rise to higher levels, and through discovery and achievement create conditions elevating all humanity to a new plane. What personal effort gains is held through social co-operation. Society is at fault when its members fall, but the favored person is responsible if he, and through him society, does not rise.

When we pass in conclusion from these social problems to questions of the individual life there is little to be gained from German literature. Our own attitude, though defective, here affords a better basis for an advance. The reason is that our movements, wherever they are not based on traditional views, are religious, and therefore broader than the German. We isolate the Church from the State, while in Germany religion is absorbed in, or subordinated to, the national life. They have nothing beyond the ideal of Germany, while we perceive the higher ideal even if creed and custom destroy its validity. Every one here nominally serves God, even though his effort and devotion are dedi-

cated to the service of Baal. We increase these difficulties by isolating Church from State. Thinking of these institutions as two entities we try to serve both. The result is a degradation of religion to the basis of an incidental interest, allowing patriotism to dominate over or suppress religious convictions. This isolation and this subordination of the higher to the lower we must remove in order to gain the consistency of thought that a broader culture demands. Patriotism and religion are not different emotions, each with its basis in our inherited psychology. They are the same psychology working under different vironal conditions. Patriotism is spiritual emotion under conditions of struggle; religion is these same personal emotions untrammelled by fear, hate and race feud. A national regard for a tribal god is not religion, but merely intensified patriotism; even if we may call these imperfect manifestations of fervor religion, it is a dwarfed religion that resembles the possible ideal religion as little as a mountain shrub resembles the oak of the valley.

B

RD - 7.6

We must have a world religion or no religion. The world-pulse must draw all to itself and realign the various regions in co-operative economic units, instead of race or language units. When this transformation comes our thought will be blended with, and not so antagonistic to, the Germans. We differ from them in race, language and history; we are the same in heredity and economic interest. Struggle and patriotism arise from our differences; religion, peace and prosperity from our similarities. The promised day comes when we refuse longer to put localized patriotism above an eager service of humanity. The world-pulse must win; we must yield and be absorbed in its current. The higher nation is not the one which plants its battle flag on the ruins of its neighbor, but that which earns its neighbor's gratitude by service and good-will. Shall we yield when we might by arms become the victor? Yes. "He who would save his life must lose it" is as true of nations as of individuals. Salvation is worthless that comes only to you, to me, or to our race. Nations gain only as

they lose themselves in the world-pulse that grows until it becomes God-like. When we leave the bounds of personality and nation all is peace, harmony and effectiveness. We will still grow but our growth enlarges not only ourselves but the universe as well. God's growth makes Him human; our growth makes men divine. Words lose their meaning when differences fade in the radiance of the joy that is to be.





DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

JAN 79
ST. AUGUSTINE



FLA.

32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 894 036 A